

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 11 MAY 2005

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WIPO

PCT

To:

Berggren OYAB
P.O.Box 16 (Jaakonkatu 3 a)
FI-00101 HELSINKI
FINLAND

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

04 -05- 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference

BP110027

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/FI2004/000803

International filing date (day/month/year)

28-12-2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

29-12-2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

G06F17/60, H04L9/32

Applicant

OY VEIKKAUS AB ET AL

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE
Patent- och registreringsverket
Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Authorized officer

Tomas Erlandsson /ITW

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FI2004/000803

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/FI2004/000803

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	2-13, 17-30, 32-33, 35-37	YES
	Claims	1, 14-16, 31, 34, 38	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-38	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-38	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The claimed invention relates to real time betting in a communications system. In such systems there is a risk that the time-stamp of a bet is tampered with in such way that a bet is made later than it appears to have been made. The problem is solved by repeatedly sending time-stamps from a central location to distributed devices and to compare the central time with the time in the distributed devices.

Documents cited in the International Search Report:

D1: Hämäläinen P et al "Offline Architecture for Real-Time Betting"
D2: WO 0227674 A1
D3: US 2003023853 A1
D4: US 5871398 A
D5: WO 2004036396 A1

D1, as indicated by its title, relates to real time betting. In particular there is means for taking care of tempering with time-stamps (section 3.1).

D2 discloses a prior art, cited in the current application, betting system without measures against time tampering.

D3 shows a time validation system, that is, a system taking care of tampering with time-stamps, intended for pay-TV (side 2, lines 29-53). It is also indicated that it should be obvious to use this method for other applications (page 3, lines 36-43).

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FI2004/000803

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V

D4 and D5 are other prior art betting systems.

The invention according to independent claims 1,14-16, 31, 34 and 38 is not novel with respect to D1.

The further details added in the dependent claims may not all be explicit in D1, but it is not obvious that any of these details gives a surprising contribution to the solution of any inventive problem. Thus, the invention according to these claims is not considered to involve an inventive step.

The invention according to claims 1,14-16, 31, 34 and 38 is not novel. The invention according to claims 2-13, 17-30, 32-33 and 35-37 is not considered to involve an inventive step. The invention according to claims 1-38 is industrially applicable.